

al/Graf et al combination equally apply to the current rejection of Reichold et al in view of Graf et al.

In addition, it is noted that Reichold is classified in 134/18, which is the same as Chan et al. Thus, applicants are frustrated that the examiner did not cite Reichold in the first Office Action despite having to search the exact same class and sub-classification, and that Reichold was applied in the same fashion as Chan et al. Especially since very little amendments have been introduced in regard to independent claims 18 and 29, applicants believe that the examiner should have been able to anticipate that applicants reaction to the Reichold et al/Graf et al combination would be almost identical to the traversal set forth in regard to Chan et al/Graf et al. Equally frustrating is that the examiner has for the first time rejected claim 29 based on Graf et al alone, even though Graf et al has been cited at least since the first Office Action.

Claims 18 and 20-26 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Reichold (US 2003/0127110) in view of Graf et al (4,188,807). In addition, claim 27 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Reichold et al in view of Graf, and further in view of Matz (4,839,454). Further claim 28 was rejected over Reichold in view of Graf and Matz, and further in view of McNabb. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 is directed to a dishwashing machine comprising: a washing container for retaining therein items to be washed; and a dosing device operable to add an additive product into the dishwashing machine, the dosing device being operatively connected to an arrangement that separately stores the basic chemical products of an all-round additive product independent of one another and the dosing device being operable to independently add into the dishwasher 1) at least a portion of a selected one of at least one basic chemical product of the all-round additive product not used for clear rinsing, 2) at least two, but not all, of the basic chemical products of the all-round additive product together, and 3) at least one reaction mixture including the basic chemical products of the all-round additive product.

Reichold teaches the use of containers 50, 51 and 52 which are provided to store detergent, a rinse additive and a sanitizer chemical, respectively. As with Chan et al, Reichold et al's sanitizer chemical would be delivered only at low temperatures, whereas the detergent 50 would likely be delivered at high temperatures. Therefore, a person skilled in the art would find that Reichold et al does not deliver different substances in a form comprising a reaction mixture. In the Office Action, paragraph 9, it is admitted that Reichold does not teach that the dosing

device is operable to add a reaction mixture of the chemical products. In addition, the Office Action admits that Reichold does not teach that the dosing device is operable to independently add at least two but not all of the chemicals together.

In order to make up for these deficiencies, the Office Action relies on the teachings of Graf et al. However, Graf does not cure the deficiencies of Reichold et al. Since Reichold et al cannot deliver a reaction mixture, the structure of Graf giving rise to the mixing of a final cleaning mixture is inapplicable and the combination does not result in the subject matter of claim 18.

In addition, applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the teachings of Reichold et al with those of Graf et al. In particular, Graf is directed toward an automatic washing machine for textiles, i.e., a washing machine, whereas Reichold is directed toward a dishwasher. Dishwashers and washing machines use different chemicals in different ratios and employ different processes, temperatures, etc. There is no reason one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the teachings of Reichold and Graf et al.

In addition, the objects of Reichold et al are different from the objects of Graf et al. In particular, Reichold et al is directed toward a specific sensor to measure the electrical conductivity of the water within the dishwasher. Depending on the conductivity of the dishwasher, the all around detergent from chamber 50 is introduced into the cycle, in an amount appropriate for the given sensor reading. In the event that the sensor reading is deemed unreliable, Reichold et al operates in a second mode in which the sensor output is disregarded.

By contrast, Graf is directed toward separate metering of various active components of a washing machine for textiles. Thus, the teachings of Reichold et al and Graf et al lack any commonality such that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have considered modifying Reichold et al based on the teachings of Graf et al.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants note that claims 29 and 31 through 34 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Graf et al. Again, applicants must indicate their frustration with the examiner's examination process since independent claims 18 and 29 have been amended only in respect to clarity and the examiner now applies Graf as an independent rejection to claim 29 for the first

time in the third Office Action, despite the fact that Graf was made of record in the first Office Action.

In any event, applicants respectfully submit that the comments noted above regarding the combination Reichold et al and Graf et al are applicable to the rejection of Graf et al alone. Specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use Graf's washing machine for textiles for use with a dishwasher as set forth in claim 29. Applicants respectfully submit that any suggestion to apply Graf's teachings to a dishwasher are based upon impermissible hindsight using applicant's specification as a blueprint for formulating such an improper rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andre Pallapics/

Andre Pallapics
Registration No. 62,246
February 22, 2010

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-672-7927
Fax: 714-845-2807
andre.pallapics@bshg.com